Strangeness and electric charge dependent splitting of the rapidity-odd directed flow in Au+Au collisions

Ashik Ikbal Sheikh (for the STAR Collaboration)

Kent State University

2021 Fall Meeting of the APS Division of Nuclear Physics (DNP 2021) Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) Virtual Meeting, October 11–14, 2021



Directed flow (v_1) and splitting (Δv_1)

 First harmonic coefficient of Fourier decomposition of particle azimuthal distribution, v₁ - Directed Flow

$$E\frac{d^3N}{dp^3} = \frac{d^2N}{2\pi p_T dp_T dy} \left(1 + 2\sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} v_n cos[n(\phi - \Psi_{RP})]\right)$$

where $v_n = \langle cos[n(\phi - \Psi_{RP})] \rangle$

Probe early stage of the collisions - strong EM-Field



• Measure splitting with charge (Δq) and strangeness (ΔS)

EM-Field driven splitting (Δv_1) - Faraday and Hall effect?



- Beam direction: \hat{z} and Impact parameter: $\hat{x} =>$ Reaction Plane: xz
- Colliding nuclei produce B-field, \perp to RP (approx) => B along \hat{y}
- Time varying \vec{B} induces \vec{E} field => Faraday effect
- ▶ Medium expands longitudinally $(\vec{u} \perp \vec{B})$ Lorentz force pushes +ve and -ve charged particles in opposite directions => Hall effect

EM-Field driven splitting (Δv_1) ?



- Faraday and Hall are competing effects Net effect affects v_1
- ▶ v_1 for +ve particles shown (when Faraday > Hall)

Multi-strange and the splitting (Δv_1)

- Enhanced strange quarks production and identity retains during hadronization => multiply multi-strange baryons (Ξ and Ω)
- Low scattering cross section and early thermal freeze-out good probe of early stage of the collisions
- Multi-strange v₁ might be important for strangeness related splitting

4/14

Towards measurements: STAR detector at BES-II



Journal of Physics: Conference Series 742 (2016) 012022

- TPC+TOF for PID: TPC measures -dE/dx of tracks (|η| < 1, 0 < φ < 2π) and TOF measures time of flight (|η| < 0.9)
- ▶ EPD (2.1 < $|\eta|$ < 5.1) or ZDC ($|\eta|$ > 6.3) for event plane reconstruction
- ▶ Data sets (analyzed): Au+Au at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 27$ GeV (year-2018) and $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$ GeV (year-2016)

Splitting (Δv_1) : Choice of particles?





(1) Measurements with heavy flavors?

- Measurements of HFs are challenging
- Less abundantly produced suffer large uncertainties
- Absence of HFT in STAR BES-II and low production rate HF measurements are difficult

(2) Measurements with light hadrons?

- Light hadrons produced in abundance precise measurements
- Δv₁ measurements come with drawbacks:
 (a) Most of the (anti-)particles contain transported quarks (u and d)
 (b) Transported quarks have different v₁ than the produced => Δv₁ becomes difficult to interpret
- Avoiding transported quarks => Splitting can be measured with light hadrons
 Ashik Ikbal Sheikh (STAR Collab.), DNP 2021

Splitting (Δv_1) : Our Approach

- Use only produced particles, K^- , \bar{p} , $\bar{\Lambda}$, ϕ , $\overline{\Xi}^+$, Ω^- and $\overline{\Omega}^+$
- Based on Quark coalescence
- Coalescence-inspired sum rule: v_1 (Hadron) = $\sum v_1^i(q_i)$
- A new way to test coalescence sum rule (same $y p_T/n_q$ phase space, with $n_q \rightarrow$ no. of constituent quarks):

$$\nu_1[\bar{K}(\bar{u}s)] + \nu_1[\bar{\Lambda}(\bar{u}\bar{s}\bar{d})] = \nu_1[\bar{p}(\bar{u}\bar{u}\bar{d})] + \nu_1[\phi(s\bar{s})]$$
(1)



Splitting (Δv_1) : Our Approach

New idea to show the coalescence sum rule holds (with identical quarks):

$$v_{1}[\overline{K}(\overline{u}s)] + v_{1}[\overline{\Lambda}(\overline{u}\overline{s}\overline{d})] = v_{1}[\overline{\rho}(\overline{u}\overline{u}\overline{d})] + v_{1}[\phi(s\overline{s})]$$
(1)
$$v_{1}[\overline{K}(\overline{u}s)] + v_{1}[\overline{\Xi}^{+}(\overline{d}\overline{s}\overline{s})] = v_{1}[\overline{\Lambda}(\overline{u}\overline{s}\overline{d})] + v_{1}[\phi(s\overline{s})]$$
(2)
(1) (2)



▶ With produced particles, K^- , \bar{p} , $\bar{\Lambda}$, ϕ , Ξ^+ , Ω^- and $\overline{\Omega}^+$ and make combinations - having same quark mass but different Δq and ΔS

Rearranging the Δv_1 in Δq and ΔS Particles: $K(\bar{u}s)$, $\bar{p}(\bar{u}\bar{u}\bar{d})$, $\bar{\Lambda}(\bar{u}\bar{d}\bar{s})$, $\phi(s\bar{s})$, $\Xi^+(\bar{d}s\bar{s})$, $\Omega^-(sss)$, $\overline{\Omega}^+(\bar{s}s\bar{s})$

Index	Quark Mass	Charge	Strangeness	Expression
1	$\Delta m = 0$	$\Delta q=0$	$\Delta S = 0$	$[\bar{p}(\bar{u}\bar{u}\bar{d}) + \phi(s\bar{s})] - [\bar{K}(\bar{u}s) + \bar{\Lambda}(\bar{u}\bar{d}\bar{s})]$
2	$\Delta m pprox 0$	$\Delta q = rac{2}{3}$	$\Delta S = 1$	$[\bar{\Lambda}(\bar{u}\bar{d}\bar{s})] - [\frac{1}{2}\phi(s\bar{s}) + \frac{2}{3}\bar{p}(\bar{u}\bar{u}\bar{d})]$
3	$\Delta m pprox 0$	$\Delta q = 1$	$\Delta S = 2$	$[ar{\Lambda}(ar{u}ar{d}ar{s})] - [rac{1}{3}\Omega^-(sss) + rac{2}{3}ar{p}(ar{u}ar{u}ar{d})]$
4	$\Delta m pprox 0$	$\Delta q = rac{4}{3}$	$\Delta S = 2$	$[\bar{\Lambda}(\bar{u}\bar{d}ar{s})] - [\bar{K}(\bar{u}s) + rac{1}{3}ar{p}(ar{u}ar{u}ar{d})]$
5	$\Delta m pprox 0$	$\Delta q = rac{4}{3}$	$\Delta S = 2$	$[\overline{\Xi}^+(ar{d}ar{s}ar{s})] - [\phi(sar{s}) + rac{1}{3}ar{p}(ar{u}ar{u}ar{d})]$
6	$\Delta m = 0$	$\Delta q = 2$	$\Delta S = 6$	$[\overline{\Omega}^+(\overline{s}\overline{s}\overline{s}\overline{s})]-[\Omega^-(sss)]$
7	$\Delta m pprox 0$	$\Delta q = rac{7}{3}$	$\Delta S = 4$	$[\overline{\Xi}^+(\overline{d}\overline{s}\overline{s})] - [\overline{K}(\overline{u}s) + \frac{1}{3}\Omega^-(sss)]$

- Combinations have same ∆m(≈ 0) different ∆q and ∆S 7 independent combinations
- Degenerate combinations (Indices 4 and 5) Good cross check
- Measure splitting with Δq and ΔS

v_1 vs y : Ξ and Ω Baryons



Splitting (Δv_1) at 3 different Δq and ΔS (27 GeV)



Δv₁ for same mass, different charge and strangeness

- Δv_1 increases at larger y for $\Delta q \neq 0$
- Δv_1 also increases with p_T/n_q when $\Delta q \neq 0$

► AMPT (Phys. Rev. C 100, 054903 (2019)) has opposite trend for ∆q ≠ 0 -No EM-Field is implemented in AMPT Ashik Ikbal Sheikh (STAR Collab.), DNP 2021

Δv_1 -slope - splitting: hints of QED and/or QCD effect



- Δq and ΔS are correlated (see Table at page-9)
- ► For 27 GeV, slope = 0.002905 ± 0.000481 (with Δq); > 5 σ effect
- ► For 200 GeV, slope = 0.001159 ± 0.00038 (with Δq); > 2.5σ effect
- d∆v₁/dy-slope is less for 200 GeV than 27 GeV

Δv_1 -slope - splitting: Model comparison



AMPT can not explain the data (Phys. Rev. C 100, 054903 (2019))

PHSD(+EM-Field) can describe the data within the uncertainties

Summary

- First measurements of v_1 of multi-strange baryons Ξ and Ω
- Measured charge (Δq) and strangeness (ΔS) dependent splitting, Δv₁, at BES-II
- Δv_1 -slope $(d\Delta v_1/dy)$ increases as Δq and ΔS increase at 27 GeV
- PHSD+EM-Field calculations can describe data within uncertainties
 Hints of EM-Field effect in the splitting
- Net strangeness is also an important key factor for Δv_1 -slope

THANK YOU